Alpha and Omega

On the Cosmos, the Now, and the God Who holds both Ends

Oscar Gaitan

May 10, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Universe We Cannot See Whole

II. Looping Around or Looping Through

III. Life Finds its Way

IV. What Infinite Expansion Cannot Sustain

V. Zero Returned

VI. Alpha and Omega

VII. Intervention Is Actualization

VIII. Distant from here, near to there

IX. The Geometry of Anything That Endures

A Note on Method

This essay operates as speculative metaphysics, not analytic philosophy or empirical science. It proceeds by structural analogy and ontological reading rather than by strict deduction or physical demonstration. Where claims touch on physics or mathematics, they are explicitly framed as metaphysical interpretations rather than scientific conclusions. The argument advances by resonance across domains — cosmological, theological, mathematical — and invites the reader to evaluate the coherence of the framework as a whole rather than the proof-status of any individual claim. Coherence is the standard being offered, not demonstration. A coherent framework does not thereby establish ontology — that cost is accepted, and the framework stands or falls as a structural proposal rather than a proved account.

I. THE UNIVERSE WE CANNOT SEE WHOLE

The Now you are in is the only Now there is.

A clarification is needed before the argument proceeds. The Now, as used throughout this series, refers not to a temporal instant within time but to the ontological condition under which any temporal event becomes actual at all. It is not the present moment as experienced — that is a phenomenological fact about consciousness. It is the metaphysical ground that makes any becoming possible: the crossing point without which nothing passes from potential to actual. This definition is carried forward from the first essay in the series and is the sense in which every subsequent use of the term should be read.

Not a local Now, belonging to this body, this planet, this solar system. Not a private Now, generated by the fact of your consciousness attending to this sentence. Whatever is occurring in a galaxy millions of light years from this page is occurring at the same Now. This is not a claim about relativistic simultaneity, which is frame-dependent and well-established as such by Einsteinian physics. It is a claim about ontological co-actualization: the metaphysical condition under which any event becomes actual at all. Both events — here and there — require the same ground in order to occur. That ground is the Now.

This has an immediate consequence for how we think about the universe.

We are told the universe is expanding. Galaxies are moving apart. Distances are increasing. The measurements are real and the instruments that record them are precise. Cosmology does not require an external observer to describe this expansion — metric evolution is described intrinsically, and the standard account stands. What the standard account does not address is the question of what kind of structure the expansion is tracing at the ontological level. Our phenomenological position within the system limits our intuitive access to its total shape. We measure distances between points that are all moving within the same field of becoming. What we call expansion is a description of that field from inside it. The question of whether the expansion is linear, cyclical, or lemniscatic is not answered by the measurements alone. It requires a framework for interpreting what kind of becoming is occurring.

We cannot see the lemniscate whole. We are one of its crossings.

II. LOOPING AROUND OR LOOPING THROUGH

The framework developed in the previous essays makes a distinction that now becomes decisive at cosmic scale.

There are two ways a figure can relate to the Now. It can loop around it — orbiting the center without ever crossing through it, tracing a circle whose crossing point is always at the center but never actually passed through. Or it can loop through it — crossing the invariant center, being actualized there, and continuing.

These are not equivalent. They produce entirely different structures of becoming.

A figure that loops around the Now is a figure whose motion never results in genuine actualization at the center. It approaches. It recedes. It returns to approximately the same position. Nothing genuinely new enters reality at the center because the center is never crossed. The loop is motion without actualization — energy without the event that would refresh the structure. And a structure that moves without genuine actualization at its center erodes. Not catastrophically. Through the friction of repetition. Through entropy. Through the slow exhaustion of motion that never crosses into something new.

A figure that loops through the Now crosses the center. At every crossing, something passes from potential into actual. The loop does not return to the same point. It passes through the same crossing — but what emerges on the other side has been touched by the Now, actualized there, elevated by the traversal. The figure has a trajectory, not merely a rotation. It is going somewhere. Not away from the center but through it, again and again, each traversal carrying within it everything that preceded it.

The wheel that spins without crossing erodes. The lemniscate that crosses without ceasing tends toward endurance. This is not a claim of logical necessity — other topologies of becoming are conceivable, and cosmology offers branching, inflationary, and open-trajectory models that deserve serious engagement. It is a structural proposal: that genuine actualization at the center of a figure is what distinguishes becoming that endures from becoming that merely persists until it cannot. What would count against this proposal is a genuine case of enduring becoming that neither crosses a renewal point nor erodes over time — pure linear accumulation that neither thins nor returns and yet continues indefinitely. The framework does not exclude that possibility in advance. It does not presently identify such a case.

Orbit without crossing erodes. Expansion without return tends toward dissipation. The figure that passes through the Now is the figure that continuously receives what the Now contains.

III. LIFE FINDS ITS WAY

There is a phenomenon within the universe that makes this structure most visible.

The actualization that occurs at the crossing point is not exclusive to living systems. Star formation introduces genuine novelty into the cosmic order. Chemical reactions cross from potential to actual states that were not determined in advance. Quantum transitions, turbulence, the self-organization of complex systems — all of these are crossings of the Now, events in which something genuinely new enters the field of becoming. The lemniscate is the structure of all becoming, not only biological becoming.

But life makes that structure reflexive in a way that nonliving systems do not. A living system is not simply a physical system that happens to generate novelty. Its internal organization is structured toward the continuation of actualization — toward the crossing point, again and again, at increasing complexity. This is a structural description, not an intentional one: bacteria do not seek metaphysical crossings. But the organization of living systems is such that they tend to cross rather than orbit, to press through conditions that would arrest becoming rather than settling into stable states. Life is the most concentrated and self-sustaining expression of lemniscatic structure available for observation within the created order.

What appears in living systems as persistence through obstruction reflects, within this framework, a structural tendency toward renewed actualization rather than static equilibrium. Life does not invent the crossing point. It repeatedly encounters the conditions under which becoming continues. The crossing point is always present. What living organization does — structurally, not intentionally — is to tend toward it rather than away from it, press through the conditions that would arrest actualization rather than settling into the stable states that entropy would prefer.

IV. WHAT INFINITE EXPANSION CANNOT SUSTAIN

Follow the logic of infinite linear expansion to its terminus.

Matter spreads across increasing volumes. Distances grow without bound. The density of energy and matter approaches zero asymptotically. The temperature of the universe approaches absolute zero. The interactions that generate change — the collisions, the formations, the collapses, the ignitions — become increasingly rare and finally cease. The universe reaches a state of maximum entropy in which no further change is thermodynamically possible.

No change. No time. The condition of all actualization ceases not by a catastrophic event but by the gradual exhaustion of the capacity to actualize.

This is not a distant possibility. It is the logical conclusion of infinite linear expansion. A universe that expands without return, without crossing, without the lemniscatic figure that passes through the Now, is a universe in the process of maximizing its distance from the ground of its own existence. It is doing, at cosmic scale, what the will does when it orients away from the crossing point and into the loops. It is moving away from the only point at which it receives its being.

This is not a physical inference but a theological reading, and it is offered as such. Thermodynamics does not imply metaphysical alienation — that inference is the framework's own, not a consequence of the physics. But within the theological account this series has been developing, maximum entropy and ontological distancing from the ground of being point in the same direction: toward the condition in which the structure of becoming exhausts itself. The heat death of the universe, read theologically, is the cosmological name for what the framework calls the permanent orientation away from the crossing point.

But the universe was not made to dissipate. It was made by the one who is Alpha — and it moves toward the one who is Omega. These are not the first and last events on a timeline. They are the ground at both ends of the figure, holding the arc open from outside the arc, in the only grammar adequate to what is most real.

Infinite expansion without return is the universe tracing a figure that tends away from the crossing point indefinitely. What prevents its dissipation is not a force within the system. It is the Omega who

stands outside the system as its destination.

V. ZERO RETURNED

The proposition that infinite becoming is elaborated through finite traversal finds an unexpected mirror in the most universal representational system in human civilization.

The decimal number system — base ten, culturally dominant, not the only possible system and not generalizable beyond its specific structure — reaches infinity without ever leaving a finite set of symbols. Ten digits. The integers do not march forever rightward along an endless line, each one a new departure. They traverse the same ten symbols in an endless succession of loops, each loop a decade, each crossing a zero that carries within it everything counted before it. This is a feature of base-ten representation specifically. In other bases the structure shifts. The argument is not about number in the abstract but about the representational system embedded in every school textbook and every act of everyday counting in the modern world.

Within that system, the zero at ten unexpectedly mirrors what the framework calls a crossing point. In value, it is incomparably different from the zero at origin — one denotes absence of quantity, the other a completed decade carried forward. In symbol, they share the same written form. Decimal notation holds both simultaneously without resolving the tension or naming it. The lemniscate names what that tension points toward: same coordinate, different traversal. Identity that carries accumulation within it.

Five as the aphelion of every decade — $5 + 5 \equiv 0 \pmod{10}$, the only non-zero digit that returns directly to the crossing point when added to itself — is a property of modulo ten arithmetic specifically. It does not generalize to other bases without modification. As a symbolic analogy for the structure of departure and return, it is suggestive. As a mathematical demonstration, it is bounded by the representational system in which it operates.

What this unexpected mirror shows is not that the decimal system proves the lemniscate. It shows that when human beings constructed their primary tool for representing quantity, they built into it — without naming it — a recursive structure of departure, maximum extension, and return. Infinite value through finite traversal. The zero that keeps arriving enriched. The crossing point that makes the next count possible.

A skeptical reader will note that this convergence may be projection: representational conventions do not prove ontological structure. That objection is accepted. The argument is not that symbolic recurrences demonstrate cosmic structure. It is that independently arising structures across domains — numerical representation, biological organization, cosmological becoming — may indicate recurrent constraints in how becoming is intelligible to finite minds. If the lemniscate appears in the system humans built for counting, in the behavior of living systems, and in the structure of cosmic becoming, the question worth pressing is not whether each instance proves the others, but whether they are all responding to the same underlying feature of actualization. That is a question the framework holds open, not one it claims to have settled.

The decimal system reaches infinity through ten symbols because the infinite is elaborated through recurrence rather than departure alone. Whether the cosmos does the same is the framework's structural proposal, not its demonstrated conclusion.

VI. ALPHA AND OMEGA

The Book of Revelation does not say: God was at the beginning and will be at the end. It says: I am the Alpha and the Omega. Present tense. Not two points on a timeline but one eternal self-declaration that holds the entire timeline simultaneously from outside it.

Alpha is not the first event. Alpha is the one through whom the first event was possible — the ground that held the Now open before the universe existed to be actualized within it. Omega is not the last event. Omega is the one toward whom the entire arc is oriented — the destination that stands at the end of the figure not as its termination but as the fullness into which the crossing was always heading.

Together they answer the cosmological question the expansion thesis cannot answer from within itself: what prevents dissipation? Not a physical force within the system — every such force is itself subject to the entropy it would resist. The prevention must come from outside the system entirely. From the one who is not inside the figure at all, who holds both ends of the arc simultaneously, in whose sustaining the Now is continuously held open at every point along the figure's traversal. This move from system-tendency to theological attractor is acknowledged as

a theological claim rather than a demonstrated inference. Within the framework of faith it is grounded; as philosophy it presupposes what it argues for and is offered as a proposal rather than a proof. The reader who does not begin with that faith may read it as a structural possibility rather than a necessity. That reading is not refused.

The universe expands because it was created by Alpha. It does not dissipate because it moves toward Omega. And Alpha and Omega are not two beings or two moments. They are the single I AM — the self-sustaining, non-derivative, eternal present tense — who holds the entire lemniscate of the cosmos open from outside the lemniscate, the way attention holds a thought: the moment the sustaining withdraws, the thought does not fall. It ceases.

A universe with a beginning is a universe that depends upon a sustaining ground not reducible to temporal becoming. Before the universe existed to be actualized, something held open the condition of all actualization. That something is not a prior universe, not a prior state of matter, not a prior condition of any kind that is itself within the system of becoming. It is the ground of the Now itself — self-sustaining, requiring nothing outside itself, sustaining everything within it by the single continuous act of being what it is. The spatial language of inside and outside is a limitation of the metaphor, not a literal claim: the Now is not a container with an exterior, but the condition of all becoming, which is itself unconditioned.

Alpha and Omega are not two points on a line. They are the single ground that holds the line open — from outside the line, in the only grammar adequate to what is most real: I AM.

VII. INTERVENTION IS ACTUALIZATION

The popular image of divine intervention is a God who stands outside events and occasionally reaches in — suspending the normal order, overriding natural law, inserting something from outside into a system that was otherwise running on its own. A God who intervenes is a God who is mostly absent and sometimes present.

This picture generates every serious objection to providence. Why here and not there? Why this person and not that one? Why does the galaxy spin undisturbed while a child suffers? If He can intervene, why doesn’t He intervene more?

The objections are powerful because the picture is wrong.

God does not intervene in the Now. God sustains the Now. Every actualization — the firing of a neuron, the collapse of a star, the turning of a will, the first breath of a child, the last breath of an elder, the crossing of a galaxy through the lemniscate of its orbit — is not an event that happens independently and then receives or fails to receive divine intervention. It is an event that is happening at all because the Now is being held open by I AM at this very moment.

This is not occasionalism — the position that God is the only true cause and secondary causes are merely apparent. Aquinas is precise here: God acts as the primary cause who sustains and enables secondary causes to act as genuine causes in their own right. The neuron fires by its own causal power. The will turns by its own genuine agency. God does not replace those secondary causes. He is the ground without which they could not operate at all. What looks like intervention from inside the loops is, at the level of primary causation, the continuous sustaining that was never absent.

There is no moment when God is more present than another. There is no event more touched by divine sustaining than any other. Every actualization equally receives existence from the one who holds the Now open.

The miracle is not the exception. The miracle is that anything is actual at all.

Prayer is not pulling divine intervention toward a situation. It is the creature orienting itself, at the Now, toward the actualization that was already happening. When a will turns at the crossing point — when it says, with David, I have sinned against the Lord — the mercy does not arrive in response. It was always present. The turn does not cause God to act. It allows the creature to receive what God never stopped offering.

God does not intervene in reality. God actualizes it — continuously, entirely, at every point, without interruption. What we call intervention is the moment we notice what was never absent. What we call miracle is the creature, for once, receiving without obstruction what the Now was always containing.

VIII. DISTANT FROM HERE, NEAR TO THERE

A galaxy billions of light years away is, from our position inside the loop, unimaginably distant. No human being will ever stand there. No signal we could send would arrive within any timeframe proportionate to a human life. The distance is real and the instruments that measure it are honest.

But distance is a property of the loops. It is not a property of the Now.

The Now is not located where we are. It is the universal ground of all actualization — present equally at this page and at the furthest galaxy, sustaining both in the same act of I AM, holding both open at the same crossing point. From the Now, nothing is far. The galaxy that is billions of light years from any other galaxy is simultaneous with this moment at the crossing point. Not approximately simultaneous. Not causally connected across the distance. Simultaneous in the only sense that matters ontologically: both are being actualized at the same Now.

This is what the folkloric wisdom names with more precision than most technical language achieves: Distant from here, near to there. The there is not another location. It is the ground underneath every location. The Now has no postal address. It is not closer to Earth than to Andromeda. It underlies both equally, sustaining both continuously, holding both open in the same single act that has no distance within it because it is the condition of distance rather than something subject to it.

This resolves one of the hardest questions in the theology of creation: how can God be equally present to everything He sustains when everything is so vastly separated from everything else? The answer is that divine presence is not spatial proximity. It is presence at the Now. And the Now is not in space — as a metaphysical claim, not a physical one, space is within the Now rather than the Now within space. Space is the medium through which becoming unfolds. The Now is the condition of that unfolding, prior to and independent of any spatial configuration.

Distance is real. It is a property of the loops. At the crossing point, nothing is far from anything. The galaxy billions of light years away is as close to I AM as the thought you are thinking now. Both are being held open in the same act. Both are crossing the same Now.

IX. THE GEOMETRY OF ANYTHING THAT ENDURES

The series that began with a question about time ends with a claim about the cosmos.

Everything the previous essays established at the scale of a single soul holds at every scale the framework can reach. The decimal system mirrors lemniscatic structure throughout modern numerical representation: infinite value through finite traversal, the zero returning enriched at every crossing. The cosmos enacts a version of it at the largest scale available to physical description: expansion as the outward arc of a figure whose center is held open by the one who is outside the figure entirely, whose return is not collapse but arrival. The soul, the universe, the act of counting — different scales, different contents, different traversal lengths. The same structural tendency. The same crossing point.

The lemniscate is the shape this series has proposed for becoming that endures — not as proof, but as the most coherent structural model available across the domains examined. Whether it is the only such model remains genuinely open. What the series can say is that the alternatives tend toward erosion or dissipation, and that the framework does not presently identify a case of enduring becoming that requires neither.

The soul endures. The cosmos endures. Enumeration endures. All three cross the Now. All three are held open by the same ground.

The lemniscate is proposed here as a structural model for becoming — not for being. Static structures, conservation laws, mathematical truths, stable physical configurations: these are outside the model's scope. They are not becoming; they are being, and the lemniscate makes no claim about them. The proposal concerns what happens when something is in the process of changing, actualizing, moving from potential to actual across time. Within that domain — becoming rather than being — the model observes that what endures tends to cross, and that what neither crosses nor is static tends toward erosion or dissipation. This is a structural tendency, not a universal law.

The digits knew.

Life knew.

The cosmos knows.

None of them invented the crossing point.

All of them pass through it.

R E F E R E N C E S

Scripture: Revelation 1:8; 21:6; 22:13; Exodus 3:14; John 1:1–3; Romans 8:19–22.

Aristotle. Physics.

Augustine of Hippo. Confessions.

Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologiae. I, q. 8 (on divine omnipresence); I, q. 10 (on eternity).

Cantor, G. Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers. Dover, 1955.

Dehaene, S. The Number Sense. Oxford University Press, 1997.

Gaitan, O. Zero Returned: An Ontological Reading of Decimal Structure. 2026.

Gaitan, O. (2026a). Does time need me, or do I need time? Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19558895

Gaitan, O. (2026c). Where does time end? The three Nows — Forever. Never. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19581285

Gaitan, O. (2026e). The am that remains: On the soul, the end of thinking, and the beginning of knowing. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19842987